

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are all the claims presently pending in the application. Claims 1-2 are amended to more clearly define the invention and claims 3-20 are added. Claims 1 and 19-20 are independent.

These amendments are made only to more particularly point out the invention for the Examiner and not for narrowing the scope of the claims or for any reason related to a statutory requirement for patentability.

Applicants also note that, notwithstanding any claim amendments herein or later during prosecution, Applicants' intent is to encompass equivalents of all claim elements.

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(3) as being anticipated by the Kato et al. reference.

This rejection is respectfully traversed in the following discussion.

I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION

An exemplary embodiment of the claimed invention, as defined by, for example, independent claim 1, is directed to a print system that includes a computer, and a printer connected via a network to the computer. The printer includes an archive for storing documents prepared by the computer, and a page/document layout section for performing page/document layout processing for each stored document and outputs document data undergoing page/document layout, provided by the page/document layout section.

Conventional printing systems do not include printers that have a page/document layout function. Therefore, before storing print data in the printer, the user needs to perform any page/document layout functions that might become necessary. This requirement

increases the time and labor involved when a document needs to be reprinted.

In stark contrast, the present invention provides a printer that includes a page/document layout section for performing page/document layout processing. In this manner, page/document layout functions are not required before sending a document to a printer and when a document needs to be reprinted, the printer has the ability to perform page/document layout processing.

II. THE PRIOR ART REJECTION

The Examiner alleges that the Kato et al. reference teaches the claimed invention. Applicant submits, however, that there are elements of the claimed invention which are neither taught nor suggested by the Kato et al. reference.

The Kato et al. reference does not teach or suggest the features of the claimed invention including a printer that includes a page/document layout section for performing page/document layout processing. As explained above, this feature is important for not requiring the performance of page/document layout functions before sending a document to a printer so that when a document needs to be reprinted, the printer has the ability to perform page/document layout processing.

Rather, in stark contrast, the Kato et al. reference discloses an electronic document identification, filing, and retrieval system. In particular, the Kato et al. reference discloses a document registration server 1 in communication with client computers 2-1, and 2-2, printers 5-1 and 5-2, and a network printer 4 via a network 3. (Figure 1, col. 4, lines 64-67). The Kato et al. reference explains that a client computer performs the process outlined by the flowchart illustrated by Figure 2 to generate and associate an identification code when a

document is created (col. 5, lines 9-61).

The Kato et al. reference further explains that the document registration server 1 receives a document, stores the document and writes an identification code into an index file that relates the identification code to the stored document. (Figure 3, Col. 5, line 62 - col. 6, line 27).

The Kato et al. reference further explains that an image scanner includes a image data preparation section 87 that receives image data and converts the image data into a predetermined format so that it can be combined with an identification code in a data combining section 88. (See Figure 8; col. 8, lines 25 - 61).

The Examiner alleges that the Kato et al. reference discloses a printer comprising an archive and refers to the “registration server 1.” However, contrary to the Examiner’s allegation, as explained above, and as very clearly illustrated in Figure 1 and at col. 4, lines 64-67 the registration server is very clearly not part of any of the printers 4, 5-1, and 5-2. Rather, and in stark contrast to the claimed invention, the registration server 1 that is disclosed by the Kato et al. reference is very clearly separate from the printers 4, 5-1, and 5-2. Thus, the Kato et al. reference clearly does not teach or suggest a printer that includes an archive, as recited by independent claim 1.

The Examiner also alleges that the image format section 87 corresponds to the claimed page/document layout section for performing page/document layout processing for each stored document.

However, contrary to the Examiner’s allegation the Kato et al. reference clearly does not teach or suggest a printer that includes a page/document layout section for performing page/document layout processing.

Indeed, the image format section 87 is very clearly not part of any printer at all. Rather, “image scanner 8 comprises . . . an image data format preparation section 87.” (Emphasis added, col. 8, lines 24-34).

Further, Kato et al. reference does not even teach or suggest that the image data format preparation section 87 performs page/document layout processing. Rather, the Kato et al. reference merely explains that the “image data format preparation section 87 converts the input image data into a predetermined format and outputs the resultant image data to the data combining section 88.” (Col. 8, lines 54-57).

Clearly, the Kato et al. reference does not teach or suggest the features of the claimed invention including a printer that includes a page/document layout section for performing page/document layout processing, as recited by independent claim 1.

Therefore, the Kato et al. reference does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection of claims 1-2.

III. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-20, all the claims presently pending in the Application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the Application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 9/19/05


James E. Howard
Registration No. 39,715

McGinn & Gibb, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Rd., Suite 200
Vienna, Virginia 22182
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254